

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY (v.2)

DRAFT - NOT APPROVED BY COMMITTEE

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE
November 5, 2001
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary	
Introduction.....	1
Evaluation of Hanford Public Involvement	1
Site Tours	6
Work Planning and Wrap-Up	8
Handouts	8
Attendees.....	9

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Introduction

Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues, reminded the committee that the most important task for the meeting was to finalize the draft white paper on evaluating Hanford public involvement and get it ready for the December Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting.

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), announced that EPA was heading into negotiations to set a final cleanup for the 100 and 300 Areas. There are approximately 300 waste sites in the River Corridor left to be cleaned up at Hanford, and the EPA is setting a start and finish date for each reactor area, including the reactors themselves. The negotiations should be completed around the first of the year. Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) change packages would then be sent out for a 45-day public comment period in February and March, and the negotiations would be completed by April 30th.

Issue Manager Bill Kinsella announced that Hanford Watch was looking into the possibility of a follow-up tank waste forum on Wednesday, December 5th. Hanford Watch and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) held the first forum in February. This event would probably be a six-hour, evening session in Portland and would be open to the public.

Evaluation of Hanford Public Involvement

Bill Kinsella pointed out that the committee needed to reach consensus on the draft white paper entitled "Public Involvement Evaluation" in time to make the HAB packet deadline and to support time at the December HAB meeting for discussion. Bill and Betty Tabbutt co-wrote the paper, which is intended to take stock of where Hanford stands with all sorts

of public involvement activities and provide a basis for HAB discussion. The first few pages of the paper provide an overview of the concept of public involvement. The rest of the paper describes public involvement goals that came out of articles on public involvement research and the committee discussion initiated in April.

Bill Kinsella said that the introduction of the white paper explains that issues at Hanford are very complex and technical. Even for knowledgeable HAB members, the ability to participate in decision-making is constrained by the complexity of the issues. It is even more difficult for the public at large.

The major goals of public involvement outlined in the white paper are:

1. Activities reach out to and engage the broadest possible constituency.
2. Activities are open and accessible.
3. The public needs to understand the issues and have substantive participation.
4. Early public involvement is important.
5. Regular public involvement is critical.
6. Public involvement should be interactive.
7. Public involvement must, at a minimum, be legally compliant.
8. Public involvement should be reflexive. The HAB should do the same thing it asks of the TPA agencies – listen to the public, pay attention to what the public says they need, and respond to those needs by changing the public involvement process in a meaningful way.

Bill Kinsella urged everyone to keep the eight goals in mind whenever they evaluate any type of public involvement activity. Issue Manager Betty Tabbutt emphasized that the white paper needs to state that the real purpose of public involvement is more than just a process – it is making the right decision.

TPA Agency Perspectives

Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology, and Joy Turner, Ecology, agreed that each of the goals was valuable for Ecology.

Gail McClure, U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), felt that much of the white paper was good and included goals DOE-RL had tried to implement (although not always successfully). She asked if the committee would help the agency achieve the goals. Bill Kinsella replied that one step to help DOE accomplish the goals was getting a discussion started at HAB. He was convinced the Public Involvement and Communication Committee (PIC) could not help the agencies achieve all those goals, but could raise HAB consciousness about the issue. Gail was particularly interested in the sixth goal of being interactive and wanted the committee to offer suggestions.

Dennis Faulk felt the agencies had failed during their presentations at the last HAB meeting. EPA had struggled over the years with early public participation, so timing was a very important issue for the agency. People want answers early in the process when EPA does not yet have all the answers. In addition, people do not seem to understand

that EPA makes incremental decisions. The third goal of addressing substantive issues was also important to EPA, since the agency has to clearly articulate what it is doing and why, as well as how its actions fit into the broader cleanup scheme. This is difficult enough for EPA to communicate to HAB members, much less the general public.

Joy Turner felt there was an element missing from the list of goals related to timing. If agencies are engaged with the general public, they are always learning about public values from those engagements. There should be a cumulative memory of the pattern of public concerns. Bill Kinsella agreed to add this concept to the white paper as a goal.

Marla Marvin, DOE-RL, commented that the white paper was a good start. The next step would be to provide the agencies with concrete suggestions and activities geared toward improving public involvement.

Committee Discussion

- Peter Bengtson, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), felt the paper described philosophically what the agency goals should be but did not state how the goals could be realistically applied. This effort is not just about the agencies doing a better job. It is also about stakeholders communicating to their constituencies and beyond. Peter observed that some of the most effective public meetings resulted from organizations encouraging their members to attend.
- Leon Swenson explained that in order to get uninformed people into the ranks of the informed, people would need to perceive a vital personal interest in the issues. Leon was also concerned about agency employees and contractors who were hired to lead this cleanup process and are cast in the role of decide, announce and defend. Leon asked how they could balance leadership with public involvement.
- Dennis Faulk commented that the Hanford Advisory Board section of the Existing Mechanisms for Public Involvement should note that HAB members are a vital way to build trust among constituents. Bill Kinsella replied that Board members have a substantial amount of trust in the agencies, whereas many members of the public are alienated from the process. Sometimes, the public starts to think that HAB members are in cahoots with agencies. Leon Swenson asked how meaningful dialogue could occur in a situation where there is such a lack of trust in the agencies. Peter Bengtson noted that giving more notice than what is required by regulatory drivers might help. Bill noted that he would add a tenth goal on trust and relationships with the public.
- Amber Waldref, Public Involvement and Communications Committee chair, suggested adding something about how the public could get a final response to their comments. Bill Kinsella agreed to add something to the third goal about agencies taking public input and putting it to use, so that it is clear how the public's ideas have been integrated into agency decisions. Betty Tabbutt cautioned that the demand for responsiveness must be reasonable

Bill Kinsella reviewed the "Existing Mechanisms for Public Involvement," which was developed based on the matrix charts completed over the summer. Heart of America Northwest, the Oregon Office of Energy, the U.S. Department of Energy, the Washington State Department of Ecology, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency had all

completed charts. The mechanisms outlined in the white paper are a summary of the 50 or so items that were on the charts.

Bill Kinsella explained each of the mechanisms listed. The mechanism of Community Outreach offers an opportunity to work on the direct democracy principle. Bill pointed out that HAB is a representative democracy, not a direct democracy. There are problems with representative democracy when representatives get too familiar with agencies and do not communicate adequately with their constituencies. That is why both forms of democracy need to operate side-by-side at Hanford. Electronic and Interactive Media is probably one of the largest techniques in use. Emergency Preparedness Activities was identified by the Oregon Department of Energy.

Bill Kinsella asked for committee input for the Environmental Impact Statements and Meetings mechanisms. In addition, Bill asked the committee for suggestions on other important things to note under Site Tours and Telephone Access.

There was also discussion regarding public participation grants. Some DOE-RL grants are administered through Ecology. Ecology also receives state funding from the petroleum tax. EPA manages monies for technical assistance grants.

Committee Discussion

- Meeting participants suggested adding public comment periods for permits and Superfund decisions; agency initiatives; budgets; and other documents and plans to the Public Comment Periods mechanism.
- Mary Anne Wuennecke suggested changing the wording of the Press Releases mechanism to News Releases.
- Under Public Involvement Evaluation, Bill Kinsella observed that it would be a good idea to distribute response cards more often and more systematically. Leon Swenson noted that another form of public involvement evaluation is word of mouth among the public.
- Bill Kinsella mentioned that he had forgotten to include the TPA Community Relations Plan on the list.
- Mary Anne Wuennecke suggested noting that all agencies prepare response documents.

Bill Kinsella requested that people email him comments on the public involvement mechanisms by November 7th. There will be one more draft of the white paper for committee members to review, and the paper will then go into the packet if approved by the committee. The committee agreed to finalize the white paper on its November 15th conference call.

The committee then discussed how to bring the white paper and the issues it raises to the full Board. Dennis Faulk warned that, in the past, when the full Board discussed public involvement, it has not gone well. Therefore, the committee should frame the public involvement discussion in a way that helps the Board have a productive dialogue. Amber Waldref encouraged the committee to focus its questions in a clear manner. Bill Kinsella

observed that the committee had a few options: it could move forward with this discussion, say it is not ready for the Board to discuss it in December, or say it does not want the Board to discuss it at all. Betty Tabbutt responded that Board members have different perspectives on HAB responsibilities regarding public involvement, and the only way to explain the committee's point of view would be to have a discussion at the full Board.

Committee Discussion

- The committee discussed discussion questions for the full HAB, which should be printed on the Board agenda. Suggested questions included: "What is the Board's role in public involvement?"; "What is the Board's role in working with the agencies?"; and "How do you reach out to your constituencies?"
- Bill Kinsella noted that not all public involvement has to do with HAB, but HAB can advise the agencies on the larger public involvement process.
- The committee considered asking a two-phased question: 1) What do you think of the public involvement goals in the white paper? and 2) Given these goals, what is the Board's role in public involvement? Gail McClure suggested that the committee could ask if HAB even wanted to be involved in public involvement.
- Amber Waldref added the question: "How does HAB want to be involved?"
- Gail McClure observed that some Board members and agency representatives felt the HAB itself was a public involvement achievement. Mary Anne Wuennecke responded that Board members did not consider themselves "the public". This led to the question: "What are the expectations for roles in public involvement regarding TPA agencies, HAB, and individual seats?"
- Betty Tabbutt emphasized that there should not be a distinction between those who represent 2,000 people or those who represent only a few people. If the HAB does public involvement, it implies that the HAB itself is in a position to make decisions, as opposed to just acting as an advisory board. Betty felt that this discussion was needed to remind HAB of who actually does public involvement.
- Mary Anne Wuennecke clarified that although the HAB does not actually go out and do public involvement, HAB representatives should be more interactive in some of the processes, such as providing advice before a meeting. Dennis Faulk pointed out that EPA uses the HAB as a sounding board to test ideas and help design the agency's public involvement processes.
- Bill Kinsella identified a few questions to close discussion of the white paper: 1) What are HAB's expectations for public involvement in terms of what the TPA agencies do, what the stakeholders, tribes and other agencies do, and in terms of what HAB itself does? 2) Does HAB want to be involved in the issue of public involvement? 3) If HAB does want to be involved, what is HAB's role in the issue – advising and critiquing the overall process, sausage-making, reaching out to constituencies, or doing collaborative work? Dennis Faulk suggested that Bill get feedback on the questions from someone who was not at the meeting. Bill replied that he would send the questions to Amber Waldref, Ruth Siguenza, Barb Wise, Joy Turner, and Max Power and ask for their input.
- The committee agreed that Bill should replace the old questions in the white paper with the new list developed at the meeting. It also agreed that the white paper should

be brought to the HAB in December for a two-hour discussion. Ruth Siguenza suggested that the discussion on public involvement could be a link to the work of the ad hoc task force and the budget development process, both of which are priorities for the Board in the near term.

Site Tours

Betty Tabbutt explained that the committee should discuss whether or not it wanted to look into how cleanup is being explained during site tours. Site tours include any opportunity where people are at Hanford discussing the site with the agencies. Betty's proposal was to put together a survey that the agency or contractor conducting tours could give to people after the tour. This way the agency or contractor would have immediate feedback on how people felt about the tour and what they learned about cleanup. Many more people take tours than attend public meetings, and a wider variety of people attend site tours, including congressional members and staff. Betty's goal was to start a discussion on this topic and get feedback from the agencies.

Mary Golde, DOE-RL, explained that 2-3,000 people tour the site each year. Gail McClure noted that DOE has many types of tours, and people tour for different reasons. Saturday tours are open to the public and run by Fluor Hanford. Mary showed the committee the survey form that is distributed for the Saturday tour and the script that is used. Jacquie Lewis, Fluor Hanford, pointed out that the majority of Fluor tours are basic information tours (what Hanford is, why it was started) that also can describe issues of specific interest to whoever is on the tour.

Committee Discussion

- Gerry Pollet described his tour guide from May as a "wild card," a retiree who claimed that no contaminated groundwater had ever left the boundaries of Hanford into the Columbia River and that a plutonium explosion had not released radioactivity. Bill Kinsella explained that during a Saturday site tour he had taken, the material presented was very positive and focused on the role Hanford had played in winning World War II. Bill felt that this story was told to the exclusion of all the other issues of contamination at the site.
- Dennis Faulk compared DOE-RL's survey and Betty Tabbutt's draft survey and commented that they elicited very different responses from him. The DOE-RL survey solicited input on ways to improve the tour, whereas Betty's survey assessed what people learned and whether they got the breadth, depth and seriousness of what was going on. The key question is: What kinds of information and responses do we want from the public? Betty clarified that she was very focused on getting public support for funding, so her questions were narrow and rhetorical.
- Two issues emerged for Bill Kinsella: content and quality control. The content of the site tours is very consequential to Hanford funding, how the agencies are perceived, and public understanding of what the problems are at Hanford. Careful thought should be given to those consequences. After content is scoped out, they should consider quality control.

- Betty Tabbutt claimed that the public does not always know there is a cleanup underway when it tours the site, and it may be DOE's opportunity to educate people beyond what the public expects when it asks for a tour.
- Gerry Pollet expressed concern that the committee felt the tours specific purpose was to educate the public about the need and challenge of the cleanup mission, while the management's emphasis was on the historical role of Hanford. Gerry was disturbed that the tours did not mention how groundwater contaminants threaten the Columbia River or how much time and money it would take to vitrify high-level wastes. He does not want people to walk away from these tours with a sense that everything is fine.
- Dennis Faulk suggested the committee take on this issue. One of the frustrating things for EPA is building more support out in the region, and this may be one way to build that support.
- Leon Swenson observed that people giving the road tours are generally former employees who would not say anything to cast aspersions on their life's work. As long as tours continue to be staffed this way, the cleanup issues will not be effectively addressed since the knowledge base is not there for the tour guides. This distressed Betty Tabbutt even more.
- Dennis Faulk noted that there was a place for both kinds of tours; there are different tours for different reasons.

Mary Golde described the attendance for the various types of tours. The Saturday road tours attract around 500 people per year. Other tours are offered for VIPs, people who visit the lab and have technical interests, and clubs or people who are specifically interested in Hanford. Bill Kinsella suggested that if the Saturday morning tours are the committee's main concern, and they only involve 500 people per year, maybe the issue was not as big as the committee had thought. The other 2,500 people are on very different kinds of tours.

The committee agreed to work on the surveys. Betty Tabbutt responded that if the committee wanted to bring this issue before the HAB as a piece of draft advice, she needed suggestions on specific wording and how surveys should be used.

Mary Golde further explained that site tours for the general public begin in March and run through September, so she would need input from the group by February. Ruth pointed out that there were two ways for the committee to handle this issue: it could give the agencies a flavor of their committee discussion, or it could have a more formal process involving the full Board. Marla Marvin felt that the some of the Board's most important work was looming, such as the River Corridor Contract Draft Request for Proposals and end states for the Central Plateau. She suggested it might be best for the committee to give the agencies a flavor of its discussion and then take up the issue in a year. If the agencies do not respond and improve the tour content after a year, then the committee could make this a big issue and take it to the full HAB.

Mary Golde invited the committee to provide feedback on the script for the Saturday tours through Kim Ballinger.

Work Planning and Wrap-Up

The committee adopted the meeting summary for its September meeting.

Ruth Siguenza reminded the committee that the Board had decided to create an ad hoc task force whose work would focus on eleven questions developed at the last HAB meeting. Part of the Board agreement to create the task force was that each committee would look at its work plan and see what work is time critical over the next three to six months and what work could be deferred. The ad hoc task force would be a big effort and require participation by members of all committees. One question out of the eleven specifically related to public involvement was: "What public involvement activities are necessary to support TPA milestones?" Ruth asked the committee to review the items on its work plan and answer two questions: 1) Is it an item that committee members can work on in the context of the task force; and 2) Is it something that is absolutely time critical between now and April? The committee concluded that it had two items of importance to work on: public involvement for the budget development process in collaboration with the Budgets and Contracts Committee and public involvement issues related to the ad hoc task force.

Ruth Siguenza announced that the first meeting of the ad hoc task force would be on Thursday, November 8 to set up the task force, including how it would operate and the work products it would take on over the next three to six months. Marla Marvin specifically requested that Amber Waldref and Bill Kinsella participate in the task force's work, given the importance of public involvement. Ruth clarified that the task force would probably not parcel out work to individual committees, but instead would be a synergy of all committees.

Barb Wise noted that some DOE managers and staff from both the Office of River Protection and the Richland Operations Office might not be available for the Executive Issues Management call, due to an emergency exercise on the 15th. Kim Ballinger and Barb agreed to help assess how many people might be involved.

Barb Wise also reported that the TPA Quarterly Public Involvement Meeting would be held in Portland at the Oregon State Office Building.

The Public Involvement and Communication Committee agreed that it did not need to have a meeting in December.

Handouts

- Public Involvement and Communication Committee Meeting Agenda; November 5, 2001
- HAB Budget Process Timeline for Fiscal Year 2002; October 9, 2001
- HAB Budget Process Timeline Template; October 9, 2001

- HAB Public Involvement and Communication Committee – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Public Involvement and Communication Activities Table; November 5, 2001
- HAB Public Involvement and Communication Committee – Oregon Office of Energy – Public Involvement and Communication Activities Table; November 5, 2001
- HAB Public Involvement and Communication Committee – U.S. Department of Energy – Public Involvement and Communication Activities Table; November 5, 2001
- HAB Public Involvement and Communication Committee – Washington State Department of Ecology – Public Involvement and Communication Activities Table; November 5, 2001
- Draft Survey – Tour of the Hanford Site; August 1, 2001
- Evaluation Form for Hanford Site Tours; November 5, 2001
- What Values Should Guide Exposure Scenario Decisions in the River Corridor and Central Plateau; November 2, 2001
- Hanford Site Tour Evaluation Form; November 5, 2001
- Welcome to Hanford letter; Marla Marvin, DOE-RL; November 5, 2001
- Hanford Area Tour Script; revised July 2001
- Hanford Advisory Board Draft White Paper – Public Involvement Evaluation – Version 1; Bill Kinsella and Betty Tabbutt; November 5, 2001
- Public Involvement and Communication Committee – Work Planning Table; October 17, 2001

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Gerry Pollet	Bill Kinsella	Leon Swenson
Betty Tabbutt (phone)	Amber Waldref	

Others

Kristy Collins, DOE-RL	Joy Turner, Ecology (phone)	Nancy Myers, BHI
Mary Golde, DOE-RL	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Kim Ballinger, Critique
Marla Marvin, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Natalie Renner, EnviroIssues
Gail McClure, DOE-RL	Susan Coburn-Hughs, Oregon Office of Energy	Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues
		Jacque Lewis, Fluor Hanford
		Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford
		Chris Chamberlain, Nuvotec
		Peter Bengtson, PNNL